



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,618	01/30/2008	Timothy John Hughes	038871.58287US	5012
23911	7590	05/10/2012	EXAMINER	
CROWELL & MORING LLP			LANDEROS, IGNACIO EMMANUEL	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP				
P.O. BOX 14300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			3785	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/10/2012	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

edocket@crowell.com
tche@crowell.com
maellyn1@aol.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief		Application No. 10/594,618	Applicant(s) HUGHES ET AL.
		Examiner IGNACIO E. LANDEROS	Art Unit 3785
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --			
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 April 2012</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
<u>NO NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED</u>			
1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection. No Notice of Appeal has been filed. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114 if this is a utility or plant application. Note that RCEs are not permitted in design applications. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:			
a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.			
b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action; or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.			
c) <input type="checkbox"/> A prior Advisory Action was mailed more than 3 months after the mailing date of the final rejection in response to a first after-final reply filed within 2 months of the mailing date of the final rejection. The current period for reply expires <u> </u> months from the mailing date of the prior Advisory Action or SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is earlier.			
<i>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a), (b) or (c). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THIS ADVISORY ACTION IS THE FIRST RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S FIRST AFTER-FINAL REPLY WHICH WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. ONLY CHECK BOX (c) IN THE LIMITED SITUATION SET FORTH UNDER BOX (c). See MPEP 706.07(f).</i>			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) or (c) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>			
2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendments filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because			
a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);			
c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or			
d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.			
6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): (a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or (b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered, and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.			
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>			
8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing the Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).			
10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.			
<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>			
11. <input type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.			
12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.			
13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
<u>STATUS OF CLAIMS</u>			
14. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: _____.			
Claim(s) objected to: _____.			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-9 and 11-13.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.			
/CHERYL J. TYLER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3744		/I. E. L./ Examiner, Art Unit 3785	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Although the prior art of record discloses the claimed invention, the amendments raise new issues (i.e. is in a non-contact thermal interface between a cooling stage of the refrigerator and a base of a closed recondensing chamber) that would require further consideration as to how to combine the teachings of Curtis to modify the reference of Xu. .

Continuation of 13. Other: The amended drawing includes new subject matter that was not present in the originally filed claims, specification, or drawings. The superconducting windings must be within the cryostat, placing the superconducting windings at the center, outside of the cryostat, would disable the superconducting windings from being cooled as set forth in the specification. On page 11, paragraph 2 and page 12, paragraph 1, Applicant argues that Xu and Curtis fail to individually disclose a dual recondenser arrangement in which the thermal interface of both chambers is a non-contact recondensing arrangement. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Examiner submits that Xu teaches a dual recondenser arrangement (23, 38) (fig. 1 of Xu), while Curtis is used for its generic teaching of having a non-contact thermal interface (18) (fig. 1 of Curtis) to modify the Xu reference to have a non-contact thermal interface rather than a mechanically connected gasket thermal interface (29, fig. 2 of Xu). On page 12, paragraph 2, Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Xu and Curtis to arrive at the dual recondenser arrangement of claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, using the non-contact thermal interface teaching of Curtis to modify the Xu thermal interface to be a non-contact thermal interface rather than a mechanical interface, would have achieved expected results, such as using less parts to fabricate such a cryostat or to more uniformly cool the recondensing surface. On page 12, paragraph 3, Applicant argues that there is no evidence that the arrangement of Curtis would provide more uniform cooling compared to the iridium washer arrangement disclosed by Xu. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Providing a direct mechanical contact between the two heat exchanging bodies creates a smaller surface area in which the two bodies achieve heat exchange because less surface area is in direct contact with the heat exchanging bodies. In contrast, providing no mechanical contact, thereby enabling recondensing cryogenic fluid to contact the heat exchanging surface in which the two bodies achieve heat exchange, creates a larger surface area for heat exchange, hence more uniformly cooling the surface area since the entire surface is used as a heat sink.